1 2 3 4 5 6	Katherine A. Klimkowski (SBN 263099) kaklimkowski@jonesday.com JONES DAY 3161 Michelson Drive, Suite 800 Irvine, CA 92612.4408 Telephone: (949) 851-3939 Facsimile: (949) 553-7539  Attorneys for Defendant EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTION.						
7 8 9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
10							
11 12	EDEN KRETCHET,  Plaintiff,	Case No.CV-14-01953 DMG (RZx)					
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	TRANS UNION LLC, EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS INC. EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES LLC, CAPITAL ONE BANK (USA) N.A., BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION, NATIONAL CREDIT ADJUSTERS LLC, CALIFORNIA BUSINESS BUREAU INC., LVNV FUNDING LLC, DOES 1 TO 10, INCLUSIVE.  Defendants.	DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO THE COURT'S ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: MOTION TO REMAND  Hearing Date: May 16, 2014 Time: 9:30 a.m. Courtroom: 7					
21 22 23 24 25	I. INTRODUCTION  Plaintiff Eden Kretchet ("Plaintiff") alleges Defendants violated the Fair  Credit Reporting Act ("FCRA") and therefore remand is improper. The crux of  Plaintiff's claims against Defendants arise out of the reporting of account						
<ul><li>26</li><li>27</li><li>28</li></ul>	information on Plaintiff's credit reports. Plaintiff's First Cause of Action alleges Defendants were "reporting the same negative account information multiple times in violation of the <b>Fair Credit Reporting Act</b> ." (Complaint at 3:24-26).						

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

1 Plaintiff's Second Cause of Action alleges Defendants were reporting "negative" 2 account information in which the delinquency of the account was being reported as 3 having occurred much more recently than was actually the case in violation of the 4 Fair Credit Reporting Act." (Complaint at 4:20-24). Plaintiff has alleged 5 violations of a federal statute, the FCRA. This Court has original jurisdiction under 6 28 U.S.C. § 1331, as well as supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law 7 claims, which are based on the exact same set of facts as the federal claims. 8 Therefore, the case should not be remanded for lack of subject matter jurisdiction 9 and Plaintiff's Motion to Remand should be denied. 10 II. **FACTS** Plaintiff filed this case on February 14, 2014, alleging violations of the 11 12 FCRA and Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies Act ("CCRAA") in relation to 13 allegedly inaccurate information on his credit reports. Experian Information 14 Solutions, Inc. ("Experian") was served with the Summons and Complaint on 15 February 14, 2014. (Declaration of Katherine A. Klimkowski in Support of Defendants' Response to Court's Order to Show Cause re: Remand ["Klimkowski 16 17 Decl."] ¶ 3. Ex. A) On March 14, 2014, Experian filed the Notice of Removal to 18 the United States District Court for the Central District of California. See Dkt. 19 Entry. No. 1. Experian served Plaintiff on March 14, 2014 with the Notice of 20 Removal and Certificate of Interested Parties filed in Federal Court. See Dkt. Entry 21 No's. 1-2. Experian also served Plaintiff with the Notice of Removal filed in State 22 Court. Klimkowski Decl. ¶ 4, Ex. 2. On March 28, 2014, Defendant National Credit Adjusters, LLC. filed a 23 24 Consent to Removal. See Dkt. Entry. No. 8. On April 11, 2014, Defendant FIA Card Services, N.A. filed a Joinder to Removal of Action.<sup>2</sup> See Dkt. Entry. No. 14. 25 26 Defendant National Credit Adjusters, LLC is working to resolve the case 27 with Plaintiff. <sup>2</sup> Defendant Trans Union, LLC, Defendant Equifax Information Services, 28 LLC, and Defendant LVNV Funding, LLC have not yet appeared in the case. See

- 2 -

IRI-62125v2

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO ORDER TO

SHOW CAUSE

Plaintiff filed his Notice of Motion and Motion to Remand on April 10, 2014. See Dkt. Entry. No. 16.

## III. **ARGUMENT**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## This Court Has and Should Retain Jurisdiction over Plaintiff's Α. FCRA Claim.

A Federal District Court has removal jurisdiction over any civil action brought in State court for which the district court would have had original federal jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a). The district courts are vested with original jurisdiction over cases "arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 1331. The claims of relief against Defendants alleged in Plaintiff's Complaint arise under the federal FCRA, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1681-1681u. Experian is a corporation which, for monetary fees, regularly engages in whole or in part in the practice of assembling consumer credit information or other information on consumers for the purpose of furnishing consumer reports to third parties. Experian uses means or facilities of interstate commerce for the purpose of preparing or furnishing consumer reports, and therefore is a "consumer reporting" agency" within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1681a(f).

Plaintiff argues that this action does not arise under the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act. (Mot. To Remand at 1:24-25). However, Plaintiff alleges Defendants were reporting negative account information multiple times in violation of the FCRA. (Complaint at 3:24-26.) Plaintiff further alleges Defendants were reporting "negative account information in which the delinquency of the account was being reported as having occurred much more recently than was actually the case in violation of the **Fair Credit Reporting Act**." (Complaint at 4:20-24). Thus, Plaintiff has stated claims under federal law and therefore vested this Court

<sup>(</sup>continued...)

Court Docket. Defendant California Business Bureau Inc. has been dismissed. See Dkt. Entry No. 18.

with federal question jurisdiction. This court has original subject matter jurisdiction over the above-captioned action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 15 U.S.C. § 1681p. Therefore, removal was proper.

## B. This Court Has Supplemental Jurisdiction Over Plaintiff's Claims.

Federal law provides that "in any civil action of which the district courts have original jurisdiction, the district courts shall have supplemental jurisdiction over all other claims that are so related to claims in the action within such original jurisdiction that they form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution." 28 U.S.C. § 1387(a). The exercise of supplemental jurisdiction by a district court over state law claims is appropriate where the nonfederal claims "derive from a common nucleus of operative fact and are such that a plaintiff would ordinarily be expected to try them in one judicial proceedings." *Trs. Of the Constr. Indus. & Laborers Health & Welfare Trust v. Desert Valley Landscape & Maint., Inc.*, 333 F.3d 923, 925 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Savage v. Glendale Union High Sch., Dist. No. 205, Maricopa Cty.*, 343 F.3d 1036, 1051(9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003) (supplemental jurisdiction was proper where "the same facts and circumstances that form the basis for Savage's claims under the ADA and RA support her [state law] claim").

Here, Plaintiff's FCRA claims substantially overlap with the state claims in that they are all related to allegedly inaccurate and/or negative credit information contained in Plaintiff's credit reports. "The 'substantially predominate' standard ... is not satisfied simply by a numerical count of the state and federal claims the plaintiff has chosen to assert on the basis of the same set of facts." *Bourough of W. Mifflin v. Lancaster*, 45 F.3d 780, 789 (3d Cir. 1995). Where the "state causes of action require consideration of similar facts and issues as [the] federal claim, ... state law claims cannot be said to substantially predominate over [the] federal claim." *Bavand v. OneWest Bank FSB*, 2012 WL 1884668, at \*4 (W.D. Wash. May 22, 2012). Plaintiff cannot dispute that this Court will be considering the same

1						
1	<u>CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE</u>					
2	I Dulas Hanson, doslars:					
3	I, Dulce Hansen, declare:					
4	I am a citizen of the United States and employed in Orange County,					
5	California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within-entitled					
6	action. My business address is 3161 Michelson Drive, Suite 800, Irvine, California					
7	92612.4408. On April 28, 2014, I served a copy of the <b>DEFENDANTS</b> '					
8	RESPONSE TO THE COURT'S ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: MOTION					
9	TO REMAND by electronic transmission.					
10	I am familiar with the United States District Court Central District of					
11	California Western District's practice for collecting and processing electronic					
12	filings. Under that practice, documents are electronically filed with the court. The					
13	court's CM/ECF system will generate a Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) to the					
14	filing party, the assigned judge, and any registered users in the case. The NEF will					
15	constitute service of the document. Registration as a CM/ECF user constitutes					
16	consent to electronic service through the court's transmission facilities. Under said					
17	practice, the following CM/ECF users were served:					
18	Cristine Cunningham Reynaert Judith Sethna Hunter R. Eley Reed Smith LLP					
19	Doll Amir and Eley LLP 355 South Grand Avenue					
20	1888 Century Park East Suite 2900 Suite 1850 Los Angeles, CA 90071 Physical Research CA 90077					
21	Los Angeles, CA 90067 Phone: (213) 457-8068 Phone: (310) 557-9100 Fax: (213) 457-8080					
22	Fax: (310) 557-9101 Email: jséthna@reedsmith.com Email: creynaert@dollamir.com					
23	heley@dollamir.com Attorneys for Defendant Bank of America Corporation					
24	Attorneys for Defendants Equifax Information Services					
25	LLC					
26						
27						
28						

Case	2:14-cv-01953-DMG-RZ	Document 20	Filed 04/28/14	Page 7 of 8	Page ID #:127		
1 2 3 4	Sean P. Flynn Foley and Man 300 South Gra Suite 2800 Los Angeles, O Phone: (213) 2 Fax: (213) 283 Email:						
5	sflynn@foleyn	nansfield.com					
6 7	Attorneys for <i>I</i> National Credi	Defendant it Adjusters LL(	C				
8 9	Executed on April 28, 2014, at Irvine, California.						
10							
11	/s/ Dulce Hansen						
12	Dulce Hansen						
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
	IRI-62125v2		- 7 - DE	FENDANTS' RES	PONSE TO ORDER TO		

1 PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL 2 I, Dulce Hansen, am a citizen of the United States and employed in Orange 3 County, California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the 4 within-entitled action. My business address is 3161 Michelson Drive, Suite 800, 5 Irvine, California 92612.4408. I am readily familiar with this firm's practice for 6 collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States 7 Postal Service. On April 28, 2014, I placed with this firm at the above address for 8 deposit with the United States Postal Service a true and correct copy of the within 9 document(s): 10 DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO THE COURT'S ORDER TO SHOW **CAUSE RE: MOTION TO REMAND** 11 in a sealed envelope, postage fully paid, addressed as follows: 12 13 Eden Kretchet 11137 Freer Street 14 Temple City, CA 91780 Phone: (949) 600-0380 15 Plaintiff Pro Se 16 17 Following ordinary business practices, the envelope was sealed and placed 18 for collection and mailing on this date, and would, in the ordinary course of 19 business, be deposited with the United States Postal Service on this date. I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court 20 at whose direction the service was made. 21 22 Executed on April 28, 2014, at Irvine, California. 23 /s/ Dulce Hansen 24 Dulce Hansen 25 26 27 28